



Approved July 8, 2009

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES

June 10, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jonathan Crotty, Chair  
Ms. Mary Ellen George, Alt. Vice Chair  
Ms. Debra Glennon  
Ms. Lucia Griffith  
Ms. Barbara Highfill  
Mr. Jeff Koenig  
Mr. John Phares  
Mr. Damon Rumsch  
Ms. Karen Rush

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Terry Sheffield, Vice Chair  
One Vacancy

OTHERS PRESENT: Mr. John Rogers, Administrator

Historic District Commission

Mrs. Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the

Historic District Commission

Mr. Mujeeb Shah-Khan, Assistant City Attorney

Ms. Tamara Titus, Liaison between DCDA and the

Historic District Commission

With a quorum present, Chairman Crotty called the regular June meeting to order at 3:09 pm. He began the meeting with a welcome to all in attendance and by swearing in those present (and continued to do so throughout the meeting as others arrived). Due to the quasi-judicial nature of the Commission, staff and others who may speak are sworn in at every meeting. (Commissioners are sworn in by the city Clerk for the length of the appointment at the beginning of each term.) Mr. Crotty asked that everyone in attendance please sign in and when addressing the Commission please state name and address for the record. Mr. Crotty explained the meeting process. The review of each application consists of two parts. The first is the presentation portion. Staff presents the application then Commissioners and those speaking on behalf of the application will discuss the project. Next, members of the audience will be asked if anyone present wishes to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application. Again, there will be an opportunity for comments and questions from the Commission and the application. The second part is the discussion and deliberation portion of the meeting. At this point, discussion of the application is limited to the Commission members and staff only. Unless the Commission votes to re-open the meeting to ask additional questions or for clarification of some issue, the applicant and audience members do not participate in this portion of the discussion. Once discussion is complete, a MOTION will be made to APPROVE, DENY, or DEFER and a vote will be taken. A simple majority vote of those Commissioners present is required for a decision. Mr. Crotty asked that all cell phones and any other electronic devices be either turned completely off or set to silent operation. He

also asked that any Commission announce, for the record, the arrival and/or departure when this takes place during the meeting.

Index of Addresses:	Springfield Square	Fourth Ward
	1318 Dilworth Rd.	Dilworth
	529 E. Kingston Ave.	Dilworth
	1937 Park Rd.	Dilworth
	729 E. Worthington Ave.	Dilworth

Application: Springfield Square in Fourth Ward – Substitute Siding.

The project covers most of the block bounded by 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Graham Street and Pine Street/Fourth Ward Park. It was built in two phases. Only Phase 2, with a Graham Street presentation, is seeking approval to replace wooden shakes with a synthetic polymer product. The Commission recently denied an application for vinyl siding. This denial was based on no exception warranted to the ***Policy & Design Guidelines*** which prohibit the use of substitute siding. The applicants were directed to search for another product and come back to the Commission with product information and installation specifications.

Applicant Comments: New property manager, Keith Radt explained that the new proposed polymer product is a weighty, molded from cedar shake, material that can be installed over the existing, failing shakes. He shared pictures of the product in place.

---

---

Ms. Griffith arrived at 3:22 pm and was present for the remainder of the meeting.

---

In response to questions, Mr. Radt answered that the product would be applied over the existing siding with the trim and window and door casings to be built out creating the same projection as now exists. He said trim accessory pieces will be modified for an appropriate overhang. Mr. Radt further explained that the proposed product offers an insulating factor, sound proofing, and pest abatement, in addition to eliminating the paint/repaint cycle. If the Commission allows the proposed material, then specifications and details will be brought back.

FOR/AGAINST: Neighborhood Resident John Cantrell spoke in favor of the product saying it is NOT vinyl but a strong polymer.

Phase 1 Resident Mary Ellen George, spoke against the installation of the proposed substitute siding.

Audience Member David Schweeman agreed that beveled corners are an important architectural detail to protect.

Neighborhood Resident Jeanne Taylor spoke in support of the installation of the proposed product.

MOTION: Based on no exception warranted to ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Substitute Siding***, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DENY the substitute siding product. A DENIAL letter will be issued. Ms. Griffith seconded.

VOTE: 8/0      AYES: CROTTY, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG,  
PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: SUBSTITUTE SIDING AS PROPOSED IS DENIED.

---

Application: 1318 Dilworth Road – Paint Brick House.

This 1926 house is listed as Contributing in the National Register Survey. Owners proposed painting the sand-colored brick to cover and conceal staining, blobs of paint, foundation settling cracks, past repair, paint overspray.

Applicant Comments:    Owner Shannon Coburn explained that a huge hollow tree was growing very close to the front corner of the house. When it was taken down they found structural damage, and dark staining. Repair work needs to be done and that will show due to the new vs. old mortar. More needs to be done and they have already some foundation work in the house they bought “as is”.

FOR/AGAINST:    Neighborhood Resident Richard Preiss agreed that the cleaning of the brick is the first place to go.

MOTION:    To give the owners the opportunity to explore other paint/discoloration chemical removers, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to DEFER

the application. Ms. Griffith seconded commenting that no exception has yet been warranted.

VOTE: 9/0            AYES:            CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL,  
KOENIG, PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: APPLICATION TO PAINT BRICK DEFERRED.

---

Application:            529 East Kingston Avenue – Replacement  
Windows.

This house is located at the corner of Kingston and Winthrop Avenues. A large front porch has long ago been enclosed with windows. The plan is to remove those windows and the wooden panels on each side which filled in to make the span from column to column. Replacement multipane, casement windows would fit the space between the columns.

Applicant Comments:    Owner Allen Foster said he installed the windows when he was 12 years old. They were from a double wide trailer. New windows will be true divided light.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Replacement Windows***, Ms. Griffith applauded the great improvement and made a MOTION to APPROVE the replacement windows as presented. Mr. Rumsch seconded.

VOTE: 9/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, PHARES, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED.

Note: Mr. Foster said he has corrected the violation issue by removing an attached shed along the side of his house.

---

Mr. Phares declared a conflict of interest as an Adjacent Property Owner and removed himself from the Commission for the next application.

---

Application: 1937 Park Road – Garage Siding Material.

A garage was recently approved for the rear yard. Approval of HardiePlank is being sought for the siding.

Applicant Comments: Owner Richard Preiss has talked with the Hardie Company and is comfortable that the product can be installed to be historically correct. He pointed out that no matter how good the product, all pales if craft is bad. Appearance and details will be closely monitored. Trim will be wood. Only linear siding will be Hardie. The garage is located at the end of the driveway with gate and vegetation between street and garage. The garage is located 225 feet back from the street.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on exception warranted by proposed remote location and obstructed visibility, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to APPROVE HardieSiding on the garage. Trim and shakes will be wood. Ms. Griffith seconded.

VOTE: 8/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITH, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: HARDIESIDING APPROVED FOR GARAGE SIDING.

---

Mr. Phares removed himself from the Commission to become the applicant for the next application.



---

Application: 729 Worthington Avenue – Change to Previously Approved Plan.

A large rear addition was recently approved for this address. This is a Preservation Tax Credit project. After submitting HDC approved plans to the state, the project has been scaled down to satisfy the Tax Credit reviewers. A side facing gable has been replaced with a shed dormer. And the addition reduced in other ways.

Applicant Comments: Architect John Phares explained the points that Raleigh had. (1) They liked the horizontality with the emphasis on the original construction. (2) They did not like the large chimney on the street side. (3) They want to see a hierarchy created with the original proud to the addition. (4) They wanted to see a reduction in size. (5) They wanted the cantilevered rear dormer eliminated.

FOR/AGAINST: No one accepted Mr. Crotty's invitation to speak either FOR or AGAINST the application.

MOTION: Based on compliance with ***Policy & Design Guidelines – Additions***, Mr. Rumsch made a MOTION to APPROVE the addition as changed. Ms. Griffith seconded.

VOTE: 7/0 AYES: CROTTY, GEORGE, GLENNON, GRIFFITY, HIGHFILL, KOENIG, RUMSCH, RUSH

NAYS: NONE

DECISION: ADDITION APPROVED.

---

Continuing in the discussion of *Policy & Design Guidelines*, Mr. Rogers began by saying that in his research he could find no policy regarding the quality of materials. A good way to deal with inferior materials would be to go at the problem from a contextual standpoint. Rather than specking out every possible situation that could be thought, use words like appropriate and matching – both in historic context and visually. Mr. Rogers was directed to draft a policy for Commission review in July.

Mr. Rumsch reported for the Nominating Committee. He and Ms. Highfill, and Ms. George recommend that the officers remain the same: Mr. Crotty, Chairman, and Mr. Sheffield, Vice Chairman, and Ms. George, Alternate Vice Chair. All three agreed to accept if HDC accepts the nomination. Mrs. Griffith made a MOTION to APPROVE the nomination. Ms. Rush seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Mr. Rogers said he will have two policy drafts for the next meeting: Enforcement and Materials.

He reported that the Government Channel will air a 30 minute show on the HDC.

The Minutes for May were approved unanimously. Mr. Crotty reminded the Commission that any changes or corrections should be reported to Ms. Birmingham.

Mr. Phares reported that h and Ms. Highfill, and Mr. Koenig and Ms. Glennon attended the Preservation Workshop in Rock Hill. All said it was great.

With business completed, the meeting adjourned with a meeting length of three hours and thirty minutes.

---

Wanda Birmingham, Secretary to the Historic District Commission